



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TATIAN'S REARRANGEMENT OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

By BENJAMIN WISNER BACON,
New Haven, Conn.

THE internal phenomena of the fourth gospel have led of late to a considerable number of attempts to distinguish between an original order required by the connection, and that in which the material now appears divided, whether, as many hold, through accident (Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, 1893, pp. 168-93), or through the carelessness of scribes (Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, p. 293), or, as maintained, *e. g.*, by Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*, Vol. I, pp. 228 ff.), and as I have before maintained (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1894, pp. 64-76), and hope hereafter to demonstrate, by deliberate editorial adaptation. The work of Wendt, and that of Hugo Delff, entitled *Das vierte Evangelium, ein authentischer Bericht über Jesus von Nazareth, wiederhergestellt, übersetzt und erklärt*, 1890, with its supplement of the same year, entitled *Neue Beiträge u. s. w.*,¹ has, however, a different purpose from that we are now engaged in. It may be possible, in spite of Baur's famous comparison of the seamless coat, to carry through an analysis of the fourth gospel which shall actually resolve it into distinguishable *documents*, or at least a fundamental document, usually assumed to be the autograph of John (apostle or presbyter), and certain superadded material. One of the keenest of American biblical critics informs us privately that he is engaged upon this task. But the general verdict of scholars on such attempts is justly of a discouraging character. The relation of the fourth evangelist to his sources is not a mere matter of scissors and paste, nor is it

¹ See also *Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth* by the same author, where the argument is given for regarding the following verses (in addition to the acknowledged later elements 5:4; 7:53-8:12, and chap. 21) as interpolated, viz.: 2:17, 21, 22; 4:44; 6:44, 54; 7:39; 12:16, 33; 13:20; and in addition the following considerable passages: 1:1-6, 9-19; 2:1-11; 4:46-54; 5:19-30; 6:1-30, 37-40, 59; 12:26-31; 20:11-19; to which 19:35-38 is added in the *Viertes Evangelium*.

to be conceived after the analogy of "redactors" of the historical books of the Old Testament. Even the perplexing question of the sources of Acts is likely to prove less intricate. Certainly the search will not be promoted by ready-made theories as to the personality of the author and his relation to the apostle, nor by artificial devices of separation, whether by sweeping classifications, like Wendt's, into narrative material (secondary) and discourse material (Johannine), or by fine-spun distinctions of style and catchwords of vocabulary. Grant, as we all must, that chap. 21 compels the recognition of more than one hand engaged upon this gospel in its present form, and that the distinction is to a certain extent supported by apparent contrasts in point of view in the preceding chapters, complete documentary analyses will hardly commend themselves to the judgment of the scholarly world until answer has been made to the preliminary question raised now by a sufficient array of competent scholars: Is there evidence in the fourth gospel of a rearrangement of material, accidental or deliberate, producing dislocation of an earlier order? On this we now engage, referring, for a brief summary of what has already been made probable on this point, to the article of Professor E. D. Burton, of Chicago, in the *Biblical World* for January, 1899, which accepts most of the transpositions suggested by Norris, Bertling, Wendt, Spitta, and myself, and proposes certain others, including a rearrangement of chaps. 8-10, of which we must speak hereafter.

The following are typical examples of the discrepancy between the present order of the fourth gospel and that demanded by the material employed:

1. Jesus' justification of his healing on the sabbath, 7:15-24, continues the discourse of chap. 5, as if no interruption had occurred. Jesus is still defending himself against the charge of 5:15-18, appealing as in 5:39-47 to the spirit of Moses' law against those who are condemning him to death for a breach of its letter, although in the meantime the scene has changed to Galilee (chap. 6), and back again to Jerusalem (7:1-13), where the preservation of his *incognito* is a condition of safety he feels bound to maintain (7:1-8).²

² This instance was first pointed out by BERTLING in the article "Eine Transposition im Evangelium Johannis," *Studien und Kritiken*, 1886, pp. 351-3. It was subsequently adopted by WENDT (*Lehre Jesu*, Vol. I, pp. 228 ff.). Both were unaware of

2. The denunciation, 10:26 ff., continues the figure of the sheep which know their shepherd, 10:4 f., and the flock kept and redeemed for the Father, 10:10-18. Yet, in the meantime, situation, date, audience, and provocation are wholly changed (10:22-25).

3. Jesus' answer to the general disbelief, 12:44-50, is spoken *zum Fenster hinaus*. We reach a carefully elaborated ending of the public ministry in 12:36b-41, explaining the rejection of Jesus by his own people as a whole (cf. 1:11), as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah, so constantly appealed to by the synoptists and by Paul (Isa. 6:9, 10; cf. Matt. 13:14 f.; Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10; Acts 28:25-28; Rom. 9:27, 33; 10:16-21). Jesus, after announcing the impending withdrawal of his light, has "departed and hid himself from them" (vs. 36b). Yet he resumes again as if still continuing the discourse of 12:20-36, although the changed situation now makes it a "voice crying in the wilderness."

4. Chap. 14 is manifestly a farewell discourse; vss. 25-31 explicitly give the parting benediction and declare that the opportunity for extended speech is over (vs. 30); vs. 31 summons the company to rise ready for departure. In my article, "The Displacement of John xiv," in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1894, I undertook to show, in ignorance of Spitta's substantially identical arguments of slightly earlier date, that the "high-priestly prayer," chap. 17, must have originally followed, while the group is standing (the attitude of prayer, Mark 11:25) in readiness for the departure, 18:1. The interruption of chaps. 15, 16 seriously injures, not only this connection, but its own connection with chap. 13 (cf. 15:3 with 13:10; 15:12, 17 with 13:12-15, 34 f.; 15:16-16:3 with 13:20; but contrast 16:5 with 13:36; 14:5 ff.).

5. The story of Peter's denial, 18:14-18, is continued in vss. 25b-27, necessitating the repetition of vs. 18 in vs. 25a. But in the meantime (vs. 24) the situation has changed from the house of Annas to the palace of Caiaphas, with the result that Peter, who was standing among a group of servants gathered at a fire of coals in the court of the former, is now in precisely the same situation, in the same group, and apparently at the same fire, but at the door, not of Annas, but of Caiaphas, before whom the examination of Jesus has been proceeding in vss. 19-23.

Other incongruities of order, perhaps not less serious to the critic, though less easy to describe, have been noted in other parts of the gospel, and are very properly brought by Wendt into relation with the discrepancy in point of view and religious feeling between the evangelist and his material, which

the demonstration by J. P. NORRIS (*Journal of Philology*, Vol. III, 1871, pp. 107 ff.) that it is chap. 5 which has suffered transposition from before chap. 7, and not *vice versa*. The result of the received order is a complete dislocation of the Johannine chronology through 5:1 and an extraordinary interruption of the account of the Galilean ministry by separating 4:46-54 from its sequel 6:1 ff.

I may illustrate in the following passages : 2 : 21 f.; 4 : 43-45 ; 7 : 1, 14 ; 10 : 7, 8b, 9 ; 12 : 29f., 33 ; 13 : 16, 20 ; 18 : 9, and chap. 21 as a whole.³

We need not wonder that none of the critics who have pointed out these incongruities of order in the fourth gospel, or attempted rearrangements, should have bethought himself to search for external evidence. But the experience which one after the other has gone through is too singular to be esteemed the result of accident. Bertling, Wendt, and Spitta all argued, as we have seen, for the connection of 7 : 15 ff. with chap. 5, in manifest ignorance of Norris' much earlier argument for the transposition of chap. 5 after chap. 6, on largely identical grounds, but principally because of the chronological difficulties of the present order. I myself, after arguing for the transposition of chap. 14, had the mingled pleasure and mortification of finding myself anticipated in almost every detail by Spitta. Such things must be expected where there is a *prima facie* case. But we have more to relate. Norris himself appends a paragraph to his article expressing his surprise to find himself anticipated by Ludolphus de Saxonia, a fourteenth-century writer, "who seems to take it for granted that John 6 should precede John 5." But how much greater must have been the surprise of Spitta, the supposed discoverer of the disorder of John 18 : 12-27, when, scarcely a year after the publication of his proposed rearrangement, viz., 18 : 12 f., 19-24, 14-18, 25b ff., the discovery of the Sinaitic Syriac palimpsest by Mrs. Lewis displayed almost exactly the proposed change of order,⁴ Blass pronouncing in regard to this reading that it is "the narrative of a real author; the other one is that of blundering scribes."⁵ Unexpected, indeed, must have been the

³Since this article was written Professor Wendt has restated his views on the problem in his volume, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1900. The analytical demonstration of composite origin is clearer and stronger than ever. One cannot say as much of the synthesis. The apostle as author of the epistles and the discourses of the gospel is as improbable a character as ever.

⁴*Sin. Syr.* gives a slightly more complicated order, 13, 24, 14 f., 19-23, 16-18, 25b ff.—which agrees with Spitta's in the essential points of combining the two separated parts of Peter's denial and omitting the duplicate 25a, but improves upon it by avoiding the confusion of applying the title "high-priest" to both Annas and Caiaphas.

⁵*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 59.

discovery; for the higher critics will be the last to admit that we have here a mere question of text and variant readings, however grateful to Professor Blass for the liberty he would give them in the field of textual criticism. For Blass not only admits the corroboration of Spitta's conjecture, but adds that Wendt's, connecting John 7: 15-24 with chap. 5, is "highly probable," and, as if this were not enough, in the most sweeping terms throws open the whole field of the text of this gospel, whose "special feature" he declares to have been "carelessness in copying and the leaving out of sentences which were afterward supplied in the margin, and from thence came again into the text, but at a wrong place."⁶ But such tremendous differences are impossible to account for by mere transcription of texts. Even those who attribute the disarrangement to accident will see clearly how inevitable the assumption will then be that it occurred before the dissemination of the text as we have always known it. Spitta himself will hardly say that the addition of 18: 25a was a *scribal* corruption; and the evidences of *redaction* which accompany the other disarrangements are conclusive. One may argue with Zahn⁷ that the reading of *Sin. Syr.* is a conjectural emendation of the scribe, anticipating the higher criticism of the nineteenth century, but if it be admitted that this is "the real order," the enormous variations made here and throughout the gospel by the entire body of MSS. hitherto known, so far from being "highly probable," would be a phenomenon unparalleled in all the annals of textual criticism. The phenomena belong to the field of the higher critic, before the dissemination, if not before the formation, of the gospel as we have it; and consequently the appearance of external evidence was as unexpected as it is welcome.

This discovery once made, however, one could not but prolong the search, to see if the second century had not other

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 239; also the notes on this and on the passage above cited, p. 59.

⁷ *Einleitung*, Vol. II, § 67, n. 12, § 69, n. 5, and *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1895, col. 20. Zahn attributes the rearrangement to the influence of Tatian, though it is certainly remarkable that just here, where we might expect an adjustment to the rational order of the synoptists, the Diatessaron, as we have it, follows its ordinary rule of forcing the synoptists into the order of John *in the received form*.

writers able in like manner with the scribe of *Sin. Syr.* to anticipate the keenness of the trained nineteenth-century expert, whether by the critic's method of conjecture based on internal evidence, or because possessed of unexplained sources of information. With surprising ease a writer of this type was found in the person of Tatian, whose Diatessaron, recently brought to light, affords us a text of the fourth gospel, practically complete, descending from a date as remote as the radical criticism of but a few years ago was willing to admit for the origin of the gospel itself. The changes in the order of the fourth gospel which Tatian permits himself are of the most surprising character, in view of the general principles manifestly adopted in his work, and prove him either to have been a higher critic of preternatural sagacity, or else possessed of unexplained sources of information on this point—in either case a decidedly interesting character.

On the question of the plan adopted by Tatian in arranging the contents of the Diatessaron in their order, which is of vital importance to our investigation, we are glad to have the preëminent authority of Zahn, who in his attempt at reconstruction arrived at substantially the same order for the contents of the Diatessaron as we now find them possessing in the Arabic text. After examining the order with a view to discovering Tatian's method of procedure, he reached the conclusion that "in general Tatian had given a decided preference to the first and fourth gospels over the other two in fixing the order of events mentioned by more than one evangelist, and this for the obvious reason that, being of the number of the Twelve, and actively concerned in the events they were recording, they would be more likely to be correct in their description of them. Where a choice had to be made between the first and fourth, he gave the preference to St. John's order, probably because that evangelist wrote later, and with a knowledge of what St. Matthew had already written."⁸

To this restatement and indorsement of Zahn's general conclusions Mr. Hill appends a very careful discussion of cases of

⁸ From *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, by J. HAMLYN HILL, Introduction, p. 26, quoting Zahn.

displacement within the limits of an individual gospel, supplemented by a table (Appendix II) of great value as showing the disposition made of the entire contents of all the gospels. He finds pretty much all the cases of displacement to be attributable to one or more of the following causes: (1) Tatian preferred the order of the event as given by another evangelist; (2) in relating two events which occurred *simultaneously* Tatian considered himself free to put either first, as seemed best to fit with his narrative, since in changing the evangelist's order he was not chronologically wrong; (3) in the case of short comments by the evangelist himself Tatian inserted them anywhere where they would fit in conveniently; (4) he permitted himself to make slight internal transpositions to improve the order of his narrative; (5) where two discourses of a similar nature occur in different gospels Tatian has sometimes blended them together, in spite of the fact that from their respective settings they appear to have been spoken at different dates or places; (6) in one or two instances Tatian has grouped together discourses on kindred subjects—or different aspects of the same subject—as though they had been spoken in immediate succession, which does not appear to have been the case; (7) having identified portions of two gospels, he has inferred that the parts which respectively follow them must have also happened at the same time and place, and has interwoven them accordingly.⁹

With all this as describing the method of Tatian "in fixing the order of *events mentioned by more than one evangelist*" we find ourselves in complete accord, as well as with the inference drawn that, with the possible exception of the identification of the cleansing of the temple in John 2:13-22 with that of the synoptists, Tatian's changes of order of this kind are not due to any lingering oral tradition, but are purely harmonistic. What we have to do with is a totally different class of displacements, distinguished (1) as being limited to the fourth gospel, Tatian's principal standard of order; (2) as not due to adjustment to the synoptists, (a) because it is Tatian's principle to do the reverse of this, (b) because they occur in passages which for the most

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

part have no synoptic parallel; (3) as not due to any of the enumerated causes, such as might partly cover rearrangements independent of correspondence with other gospels. In fact, they are neither "short comments," nor "slight," nor mere collocations of "discourses on kindred subjects," nor have they been carried over with other transposed material. On the contrary, if we take, *e. g.*, the conversation with the Samaritan woman, we shall find its historical framework, viz., the journey, which might have been brought into harmonistic identification with some synoptic account of Jesus' movements, kept in place; while the incident itself, which is devoid of synoptic parallel, is removed to Part III of the Johannine narrative. More exactly, Tatian leaves John 4 : 1-3*a* in its connection with 3 : 22-36, but instead of continuing, as we should expect, he takes out all that is told of the ministry in Samaria, 4 : 4-45*a*, and locates it in the journey of Mark 7 : 31, so that Jesus, after healing the daughter of the Syrophœnician woman, "came unto the sea of Galilee, towards (*sic*) the borders of Decapolis (Mark 7 : 30-37) . . . and as he was passing through the land of Samaria he came to a city of the Samaritans called Sychar (John 4 : 4-42) . . . and after the two days Jesus went forth from thence and departed into Galilee, and . . . the Galileans received him (43-45*a*)."¹⁰ But the only incident of this stay in Galilee is the healing of the leper, Mark 1 : 41-45.¹¹ Jesus passes on immediately to a feast at Jerusalem, viz., that of the fifth chapter of John, which here follows. Relatively to the gospel of John the result is to transpose, not only the Samaritan ministry, John 4 : 4-42, but John 5 : 1-47 as well, whose relation we have seen to be, not with the Galilean ministry which it now interrupts, but with a subsequent feast in John, chap. 7, in connection with this very chapter. Is it not possible that we have here an explanation of the

¹⁰ John 4 : 45*b* is utilized a little farther on as an editorial comment.

¹¹ Embellished by the substitution of Luke 5 : 12 for Mark 1 : 40, and Luke 5 : 15*b*, 16 for the last clause of Mark 1 : 45. But, although he thus brings down this healing of the leper of Mark 1 : 40-45 to a date and circumstances so similar to those of the leper healing of Luke 17 : 11-19 that he actually employs the same verse, viz., John 5 : 1*a*, with which he closes the one, to introduce the other, he makes no identification of the two, for this would of course have involved an alteration of the text.

unexplained transposition which Norris was so surprised to find in Rudolph of Saxony? For Tatian's Diatessaron circulated in an ancient High German and Latin bilingual translation as early as the ninth century.¹²

But neither John 4:4-42 nor John 5:1-47 has any synoptic parallel, in "subject of discourse" or similarity of incident, to influence Tatian. He could have let either remain precisely where it stood in position relative to the fourth gospel, so far as the rest of his material was concerned. Indeed, he has to make two separate journeys of John 5:1 to make room for this chapter. Nor is he influenced by a desire to coördinate the healing of the centurion's son, John 4:48-54, with its synoptic parallel (Matt. 8:4-13 = Luke 7:1-10); for the two are to him entirely independent incidents. Either reflecting on the early particularism of Jesus, Matt. 10:5; 15:24, he was driven by historico-critical motives to disregard the order of his supposedly dominant authority, or—he had reason to think these incidents came later.

We need only tabulate Tatian's resultant order for the fourth gospel to see how inadequate are the causes thus far suggested to account for the changes. The order is as follows:

(§ i) John 1:1-5,¹³ 7-28, 29-31, 32-34, 35-51; 2:1-11;¹⁴ 3:22-4:3a ("and he left Judea").

(§ ii) 4:46-54; (2:23b-25);¹⁵ 6:1b,¹⁶ 2b-5a, 5b-9, 10, 12-13, 14-18, 19a, 21b, 22-71.

(§ iii) 4:4-45a (to "the Galileans received him"); 5:1-47; (4:45b).¹⁷

(§ iv) 7:1, 2-10a, 10b-31; (5:1a);¹⁸ 2:14a, 14b-15, 16, 17-22; 3:1-21;

¹² Cf. SIFVERS, *Tatian*, 1872, pp. 1 ff.

¹³ John 1:6 = Luke 3:1-3, omitted as duplicate.

¹⁴ 2:12 omitted, probably as = Matt. 4:13-16, which follows John 4:46-54. 2:13 is purely connective and duplicate.

¹⁵ This editorial comment Tatian has adapted to his own uses by omitting vs. 23a. He appends it to the first section of the Galilean ministry before the sending of the Seventy.

¹⁶ 6:1a is combined with Matt. 14:13a. The interruptions and slight omissions in 6:1-21 are, of course, due to the closeness of the parallel here interwoven from the synoptists.

¹⁷ Another editorial comment adapted by Tatian to his own uses, in connection with the feeding of the four thousand.

¹⁸ Utilized a *second time* to introduce Luke 17:11 ff.

7:31-52;¹⁹ 8:12-11:57; 12:1 f., 9-11, 3a, 3b-6, 7b, 8a, 16,²⁰ 12 f., 17 f., 19-36a, 42-50, 36b-41.

(§ v) 13:1-20, 21a, 22, 23-29, 30-32, 33-36, 37b, 38a; 14:1-31a, 31b; 15:1-18:2, 4a, 4b-9, 10 f., 12a, 12b-17, 18a, 18b, 19-25a, 26a, 26b, 28a, 28b, 29 f., 31-38a (to "and went out again unto the Jews"), 39 f.; 19:2, 3b-15, 16a, 16b, 17a, 17c, 23 f., 19-22,²¹ 25-27, 28-29a, 30a, 30b, 31-37, 38b, 38d-42; 20:2-17, 18-19, 20b-21:24, 25.

In the above table the divisions clearly marked by the subject-matter of the fourth gospel are indicated by §-marks, separating the content into periods (1) of the ministry of John; (2) of the Galilean ministry of Jesus; (3) of a journey through Samaria and Galilee, and visit to Jerusalem; *cf.* Luke 9:51-56; 10:38; but especially 17:11; (4) between the final departure from Galilee and the night of betrayal; (5) of the passion and resurrection. These are, of course, entirely broken through by Tatian, who multiplies journeys between Jerusalem and Galilee in the interest of harmonization. But the distinction we have drawn between transpositions which can be accounted for on the principles established by Zahn and Hill, and those which are impossible to reduce under them, is unmistakably apparent. Wherever the synoptic account runs closely parallel, Tatian in the main reduces it to the order of John, showing his regard for this gospel not merely thus, but by the reverential care with which he has worked in almost every word of it at the expense of the synoptists, the only omitted portions being mere connective material or editorial comment, and the rare instances where the fuller account of the synoptic writers made it impossible to introduce some word or two of the Johannine story without a degree of tautology so palpable as to be absurd. The omissions all together scarcely amount to a dozen verses,²² and the transpositions, if we set aside the three great masses of material underscored in §§ iii and iv, are practically non-existent,

¹⁹ This verse (7:31) is repeated. See above.

²⁰ The changes of order and omissions in 12:1-16, including the omission of 14 f., are to be accounted for as in 6:1-21.

²¹ On chaps. 18, 19 see the preceding note.

²² Of course, we do not include 7:53-8:11, the spurious fragment on the woman taken in adultery, which formed no part of the fourth gospel in Tatian's day.

affecting only the rearrangement of a brief sentence or two, to adapt it to the composite story.²³

Entirely different motives must have controlled in the transposition of (1) the cleansing of the temple and dialogue with Nicodemus (2:14—3:21), (2) the Samaritan ministry (4:4—45*a*), (3) the feast at Jerusalem (5:1—47), (4) Jesus' self-vindication (12:42—50). Of these five masses of material 2:14—22 and 3:1—21 are transposed from the period of the Johannine ministry to separate occasions of the final stay in Jerusalem and vicinity; 4:4—45*a* and 5:1—47, from the Galilean ministry to the journey through Samaria and Perea after the crisis in Galilee; and 12:42—50, from after to before vss. 36*b*—41. In only one of these instances is there even an approximate synoptic parallel to suggest harmonization as a motive, and in this (2:14—22) it is extremely difficult, considering the ease with which modern harmonists resort to the standard device of *two* temple-cleansings, to imagine that Tatian, who resorts to similar devices to a degree beyond all our conceptions of verisimilitude, should have been actuated by harmonistic motives alone.²⁴ The question remains: Was Tatian a higher critic, reasoning from internal evidence and the natural probabilities of the case; or had he external evidence, oral or written, independent of our synoptic gospels? The answer is to be found only by careful scrutiny of the transpositions. If the context itself is of a nature easily to suggest the propriety of their removal, while more profound investigation shows a latent suitability to

²³ A complete list of these minor transpositions is as follows: (1) John 12:1—16 (anointing in Bethany and triumphal entry). (*a*) John 12:9—11, which describes the circumstances of the anointing, precedes instead of following it, attaching to the corresponding element of Mark 14:3*a*. This is clearly, as Mr. Hill has noted, "for the sake of neatness in the combined account." (*b*) Vs. 16, the editorial comment on 14 f., is necessarily attached to the substitute, Matt. 21:3*b*—5, and thus loses its relative position. (2) The division of Jesus' garments by the executioners, 19:23 f., precedes instead of following the account of the title on the cross, vss. 20—22, the order of Matthew being here followed (exceptionally) in preference to John, obviously because it purports to be chronological, while that of John does not. (3) In three instances (2:23*b*—25; 4:45*b*; 5:1*a*) Tatian has utilized brief touches of editorial comment for his own purposes.

²⁴ As we have seen, even Mr. Hill admits this as an exceptional case where tradition might have had an influence.

the connection in which we have been accustomed to read them, they will be due to arbitrary conjecture on Tatian's part; we may be astonished at the boldness and skill of this early precursor of German criticism, but it will be certain that the critic must consent to see himself both anticipated and outdone in his chosen field. We shall not change our ideas on the composition of the fourth gospel, though some positively expressed opinions as to Tatian's respect for its order, as assumed to represent an eyewitness, will be laid up for repairs. If, *per contra*, the context gives no such superficial suggestion of displacement, but on closer scrutiny reveals a deep-seated superiority in the order obtained *after* the transposition, especially if this phenomenon be accompanied by apparent lack of appreciation on Tatian's part of the real nature and effect of the change, it will be certain that he possessed some source of external evidence inaccessible to us.

It will be simpler to consider first the removals, and afterward the new location assigned, and, beginning with the case most favorable to the idea of unsupported conjecture as Tatian's motive, we may look first at the fifth instance, the removal of 12:42-50. Wendt and others, as we know, had pointed out the incongruity of the situation in 12:44 ff.,²⁵ though even this was disputed by so able a scholar as Holtzmann; but it seems to have needed the superior acumen of Tatian to perceive that the real break is after vs. 41, all that follows serving only to weaken the force of the dramatic conclusion which quotes the prediction of Isaiah.²⁶ Let us credit Tatian with the eye to perceive this, though we may have more to say regarding his relocation of the passage. We return to the removals from chaps. 1-6.

Let it be granted, further, for the argument's sake, that Tatian removed 2:14-22 to combine it with Matt. 21:12 ff., and omitted vs. 12 as duplicating Matt. 4:13-16; we have still to explain why the Passover visit to Jerusalem, 2:13, 23-25, is canceled, and the dialogue with Nicodemus, 3:1-21, removed,

²⁵ *Lehre Jesu*, Vol. I, p. 236.

²⁶ For an independent appreciation of the character of this *locus classicus* of the New Testament writers see the review of JÜLICHER'S *Gleichnissreden*, by SANDAY, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1900.

in spite of the fact that the journey from Cana of Galilee (2:11) to "the Judean country" (3:22) is retained. Surely we have all read this entire context many times with the mental removal of the incident of the temple-cleansing, 2:14-22, into the connection of its synoptic parallels, Matt. 21:12 ff., etc., and felt no incongruity in the remainder. Yet how extraordinarily felicitous, for a purely accidental result, is the connection which ensues when we pass directly from 2:1-11 to 3:22-4:3, and thence back to Cana and Capernaum in 4:46-54! No longer does the expression "came into the Judean country" sound strangely, when Galilee, not Jerusalem, is the point of departure. Moreover, the entire period of ministry before the imprisonment of John, a unit save for the episode of the wedding at Cana, 2:1-11,²⁷ becomes natural and intelligible, a prelude to the opening scenes of the synoptic story, which throws a flood of light upon it instead of contradicting it, and removes the tremendous difficulties of the chronology.

But one reader in many millions has observed (*a*) that it is not natural that Nicodemus should speak as in 3:2, when no particular "sign" done in Jerusalem has been mentioned; (*b*) that the dialogue suggests longer and fuller acquaintance with Jesus' teaching than the assumed circumstances admit; (*c*) that Jesus' reference to his impending rejection and death and the judgment to come, 3:11-15, 18 ff., is incongruous with 3:26-30 and the whole period of the early ministry, agreeing better with John 8:15; 12:47 f., and the period when Jesus' life is sought. Similarly it is not difficult to perceive, *when our attention has been called to the fact*, that there are serious obstacles to placing a Samaritan ministry before the very beginning of the ministry in Galilee. John 4:4-42 is really incredible at that time, even in its historical substance. We should expect the Galileans to raise the cry of John 8:48. And what of the

²⁷ Treated by DELFF as secondary (*Beiträge*, p. 18) on the following grounds: (1) the impossibility of the journey from Bethabara to Cana in the time assigned (2:1); (2) the impossibility that Jesus' disciples, who had only become such a day or two preceding, should have been invited (2:4); (3) Jesus appears in a character (2:5) such as belongs only to the period after 2:12; (4) the character of the σημεῖον in contrast with all the other Johannine σημεῖα.

public, unreserved recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, 4 : 26, 42? The difficulty is surely great enough, even if we place it with Tatian *after* Cæsarea Philippi, and the dealings with the Samaritans *after* the restriction of Matt. 10 : 5 f. had been corrected by the experience of Matt. 15 : 24–28, and Jesus' attitude toward Samaritans had altered (Luke 9 : 51 ff.). An historical critic of the first order might conceivably have been moved by considerations such as these to place the incidents of John 3 : 1–21 and 4 : 4–42 later on in his "Life of Christ." But was this Tatian's idea? Apparently not, since he retained 4 : 43–45 (except vs. 45^b), which he would surely have treated as he does 2 : 23–25 if he had acted on critical grounds.

Our Matthew, the same that Tatian employs, has no relation to the order of John, chaps. 2–4. But we need only remove the portions known to be derived from Mark, viz., Matt. 4 : 18 ff. and 8 : 1–4, inclosing the Sermon on the mount, which all critics recognize as prematurely placed, to come upon an underlying connection in Matt. 4 : 12 ff.; 8 : 5 ff., which bears a remarkable resemblance to that of John 3 : 22—4 : 3, 46–54. The correspondence becomes all the stronger when the editorial comment of Matt. 4 : 14–17 is removed, and John 2 : 12 brought into the relation with 4 : 46–54 which the handling of its substitute, Matt. 4 : 12 f., by Tatian suggests. Nor does it stop at this point. Take out the next passage borrowed from Mark, viz., 8 : 14–16 (= Mark 1 : 29–34), with the editorial comment, vs. 17, and what follows? The vss. 18–22, which form so curious an exception to the chain of ten miracles common to Mark, in Matt., chaps. 8, 9, and which begin : "Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him he gave commandment to depart unto the other side." Precisely as *in Tatian's order*, John 6 : 1 ff. follows upon 4 : 46–54!

We need not raise Delff's question whether the marriage in Cana, 2 : 1–11, forms part of the original story, for the "original" story lies farther back than we are now attempting to go. The arguments brought against this episode would lose much of their force if we removed it to the position of 4 : 46a, in the interval between the close of the work of baptizing with John and the

opening of that in Capernaum; *cf.* 3:24 (suggesting the omission of a parallel to Matt. 4:12) and 4:54. But for this we have not, of course, the authority of Tatian, who connects 2:1-11 with 3:22 ff. But few competent judges will be disposed to deny that the superiority of connection in John, chaps. 1-4, which results from the removals *made by Tatian* is both extraordinary and profound, by no means easily accounted for as the result of mere critical sagacity or conjecture. It may well raise the query in our minds whether an *earlier* form of the Johannine story of events prior to the Galilean ministry did not have the following connection: (i) introduction; (a) [prologue, 1:1-18],²⁸ (b) the witness of John, 1:19-34, (c) the call of the six, 1:35-51, (d) [the episode of Cana, 2:1-11], (e) work in aid of the baptism of John, 3:22-4:31 (44, 46a?);²⁹ and whether it was not followed³⁰ by a second division on the Galilean ministry, opening after the imprisonment of John, when Jesus, receiving the news in his retirement, comes down from Cana and begins (ii) his Galilean work: (a) the healing of the nobleman's son in Capernaum (2:12*?), 4:46b-54; (b) the miracles by the sea, 6:1-21; (c) the Galilean crisis, and loyalty and disloyalty among the Twelve, 6:22-71.

We have anticipated in the above the fourth of the great excisions of Tatian, which is made from the material of §ii, viz., John 5:1-47. The transposition of this chapter after chap. 6 we regard as already demonstrated by Norris; its immediate connection with 7:15 ff., by Bertling, Wendt, and Spitta. Is it again pure accident that the removal of it by Tatian from between 4:46-54 and 6:1 ff. not only results in a connection as perfect as between 2:11 and 3:22 ff., but removes at a stroke overwhelming difficulties of both matter and form? What can be more natural than the connection of 4:46-54 with 6:1 ff.? Jesus has done a mighty work of healing in Capernaum. He crosses

²⁸ Passages apparently *less* primitive than the surrounding sections are inclosed in []. * indicates a corrupted text.

²⁹ Or, transposing (d) and (e), the connective material of 2:12; 3:22-24; 4:44, 46, will be treated accordingly.

³⁰ I venture, however, to bespeak room at about this point for the substance of John 21:1-11. *Cf.* Luke 5:1 ff., and see LOOFS, *Auferstehungsberichte*.

"to the other side of the sea of Galilee . . . and a great multitude followed him, because they beheld the signs which he did on them that were sick." Intercalate chap. 5, and we have Jesus in Jerusalem defending his life against the rabbis in a great dialectic discourse. The occasion, we learn from an editorial note of the stereotyped form (5:1), was "a feast of the Jews," but to this day the dispute is unsettled *what* feast, every possible feast being discordant with what immediately precedes (4:35) and what immediately follows (6:4). And now the discourse against the rabbis in the temple breaks off abruptly, without a hint of how Jesus escapes, or even whether he did escape, and (from *Jerusalem*) he "crossed over to the other side of (*ἀπῆλθεν πέραν*) the sea of Galilee," etc. One would almost say in this case Tatian must have seen the incongruity of chap. 5 between 4:46-54 and chap. 6, and removed it for that reason. And yet readers for eighteen centuries did not notice it. Harmonists did not notice it. Critics did not notice it. Bertling, Wendt, and Spitta, searching the gospel for this very matter of dislocations, did not notice it, *when they had actually perceived that the close of chap. 5 must connect with 7:15 ff.* Even Norris' modest suggestion went unheeded till Professor Burton, bringing it together with those of Bertling, Wendt, and Spitta in Germany, gave us at last the true order: 6:1-71; 5:1-47; 7:15-24, 1-14, 25 ff.; with the supplementary transposition of 7:45-52 to a place between vss. 36 and 37, thus avoiding the absurdity that the officers sent to arrest Jesus do not return until several days after. The feast of chap. 5, and its sequel, 7:15-24, is therefore, as Norris perceived, either the Passover alluded to in 6:4, or more probably the ensuing Pentecost.³¹ That of 7:1-14, 25 ff. is of course Tabernacles (7:2). It is easy to see what immense gain ensues to the sense, especially in 7:1 and 25, from this final adjustment. We must justify Tatian in making the order of events after the crisis in Galilee as follows: (1) the Samaritan ministry, John 4:4-45

³¹ This is also indicated by the subject of the discourse. Pentecost was the Feast of the Giving of the Law. Accordingly in chap. 5 the debate turns upon the "higher law" and Jesus' relation to the Mosaic legislation. Similarly in 7:37 ff. (Tabernacles) the discourse turns on the ritual of water-pouring, and in 8:12 ff. (Feast of Lights) on Christ as the true light.

(see below); (2) a visit of Jesus (apparently unattended, if not *incognito* (John 5:7, 13, 15), to Jerusalem at Pentecost (Passover ?), where he heals a paralytic on the sabbath, and thus raises plots against his life, but successfully defends himself, 5:1-47 (add 7:15-24); (3) return to Galilee, where he remains in hiding until Tabernacles (4:45; 7:1-9), followed by a still more dangerous conflict at Tabernacles with the authorities at Jerusalem, in which Jesus is secretly befriended by Nicodemus, 4:45; 7:1-30 (omitting 7:15-24 and vs. 31, the latter improperly repeated by Tatian); 3:1-21; 7:31-52 (but transpose vss. 37-44 and 45-52). Disregarding for the present the location given to all these incidents save that of chap. 5, either our respect for Tatian's skill as a historical critic must be vastly increased by these results, or we must begin to suspect that he had sources of information unknown to us.' Somehow he has anticipated Norris in his discovery of the true relation of chap. 5 to the adjoining chapters, and cured the difficulties of the Johannine chronology at a stroke. Whether the fact that the early Fathers in general, and Origen in particular, seem not to have felt the difficulty, nor recognized a Passover or Pentecost at this point, has anything to do with this, may be left unsolved.

But we must turn now to the story of Jesus' visit to Jerusalem at Tabernacles (chap. 7), with Tatian's curious intercalation of the incident of Nicodemus. We know not why he should have removed it from between 2:1-11 and 3:22 ff., why he should insert it here rather than at any other suitable point earlier than the reference in 7:50 ff.; but once insert it here, and the story of chap. 7 and that of 3:1-21 are both flooded with new light. The reference of 3:2 is to the miracle of 5:2 ff., as typical of those referred to in 7:3. Nicodemus comes by night because of the danger involved in openly associating with the sabbath-breaker of 5:1-18; he is already prepared in some degree for Jesus' claims of divine authority (3:1) by the discourse of 5:19-47; 7:15-24. Jesus, on his part, is prepared to take still higher ground, referring to the unbelief and rejection he has met on the part of the teachers of Israel (3:11 f.; cf. 5:38-47), predicting his violent death (3:13-15; cf. 5:18;

7 : 19), and declaring the judgment that will fall on the wilfully unbelieving (3 : 16-21 ; *cf.* 5 : 27, 30 ff., 42-47). How strange all this, if as yet he has had nothing but acceptance (2 : 23 ; 3 : 2) ! How incomprehensible the tone of denunciation of the teachers of Israel as a class, and the assumption of rejection and death as a foregone conclusion, if in 3 : 26-30 the joy of Jesus' universal welcome is still as that which surrounds bridegroom and bride ! But insert 3 : 1-21 after 7 : 30, and the strange outcome of this first great conflict in Jerusalem is illuminated. After the philippic with which the attempt to kill him for sabbath-breaking had been met, and the pharisaic zealots, though plotting, are cowed for a time (7 : 25-30), we have the night visit of the rabbi, who goes from it prepared to play his part of secret friend (3 : 1-21). The belief of the multitude, wondering at the miracle, provokes a second half-hearted attempt (7 : 31 ff., 45 ff.), but the very boldness of Jesus' appeal (7 : 33-36) gives him a partial acceptance with the multitude, while Nicodemus plays the part of Gamaliel (Acts 5 : 33-42) in the Sanhedrim (7 : 45-52). The section winds up with a clear picture of the divided state of opinion (7 : 37-44).

Are we, then, to suppose that Tatian had the critical acumen to see the incongruity of 3 : 1-21 in its present setting, and its appropriateness after 7 : 30 ? Hardly ; for in that case he would not have introduced the section one verse too far along, viz., after vs. 31, so that, having thus broken the unmistakable connection of vs. 31 with 32, he is obliged to *repeat* it before going on with vss. 32 ff.³²

But let us scrutinize the disposal made of the Samaritan ministry, John 4 : 4-45a. Mr. Hill's statement regarding it is as follows : "Tatian seems to make this happen on the way from Galilee to Judea, if we connect it with the opening of this chapter ; this is the reverse of John's order (John 4 : 3). Yet at the close of this visit (4 : 43) Jesus departs from Sychar to Galilee,

³² Unless, indeed, this repetition of the context at the point of rupture be a device for calling attention to the change of order, as we remember to have seen maintained under similar circumstances ; *cf.* the repetition of 5 : 1a, and the division of 4 : 45. Perhaps Tatian was influenced by the resemblance of 2 : 23-25 (which he utilizes elsewhere) to this verse.

as in St. John's gospel." In reality, the journey assumed by Tatian, in lieu of that of our John, is that of Mark 7: 31, from Tyre and Sidon, "through (or between) Galilee and Samaria," if we may identify it with that of Luke 17: 11, *i. e.*, along the great road from Ptolemais, across the plain of Esdraelon, "up the midst of Decapolis" (Mark 7: 31), for a last secret visit to Capernaum (Mark 9: 30-33), and thence back through Perea to Jerusalem. Tatian, of course, does not represent that Jesus is now in danger of his life in Galilee, and hence keeps off its territory save for this secret visit across the lake to Capernaum and back (Mark 9: 30, 33); but makes of the escape to Tyre and Sidon (Mark 7: 24), with the return through Samaria and Galilee (Mark 7: 31), followed by the visit to Jerusalem of John, chap. 5, simply one more missionary tour. But the effect *in the relative order of John* is to bring this time of exile and flight, 4: 4-43, exactly where, by the best conception we can form of Jesus' movements, it ought to stand, viz., between chap. 6 and chap. 7. We understand now why Jesus "must needs go through Samaria." We understand his new attitude toward Samaritans (*cf.* Luke 9: 51-56). Since he bade the Twelve enter no village of the Samaritans, but go only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, Galilee, then so hospitable, has driven him and them into exile (Mark 7: 1-24 and parallels), and there, in heathen Phœnicia, the humble, believing pleading of the Syrophœnician has operated in Jesus' own mind, as once before (Matt. 8: 10), to effect a widened conception of his mission (Matt. 15: 22-28). After this there is related, indeed, the visit of Jesus to Jerusalem at Pentecost. But he is alone, and at first unknown, and when he returns to Galilee, though "the Galileans received him, having seen all the things that he did in Jerusalem at the feast, for they also went to the feast" (*i. e.*, the feast of John 5: 1; *cf.* *Diatessaron*, xxiii, 3), he remains in retirement. We understand, therefore, why his brethren reproach him with *remaining hid*, and urge him to make a *public* appeal in Judea, 7: 1-9. Vs. 1, which makes havoc of the sense after chap. 6, becomes lucid after chap. 5. But is it accident or sagacity which makes Tatian adopt the order 4: 4-45*a*; 5: 1-47 (4: 45*b*); 7: 1, 2-10*a*, 10*b*-31 (5: 1*a*)? The

insertion of 5 : 1-47 between the two halves of 4 : 45, instead of before it, and of chap. 7 before a repetition of 5 : 1, like the similar instance at 7 : 31, looks more like blundering than sagacity ; unless, indeed, we adopt some theory of cryptographic hints. At least we may say Tatian's work as a whole gives no such outline of the life of Christ as we derive from the study of his transpositions in the fourth gospel.

Our review of Tatian's resettings of transposed material is completed ; for whether the *removal* of the temple-cleansing, John 2 : 14-22, was primarily for the sake of harmonization with Matt. 21 : 12 ff. and parallels or not, its *relocalizing* would inevitably be so determined. We only wonder that the feast to which it is assigned is distinguished, by the subsequent insertion of John 10 : 22, 40 ; 11 : 1 ff., 54 ; Luke 9 : 51 ff. ; John 12 : 1 ff., from the final Passover. Perhaps its association in the text with John 3 : 1-21 had some effect. In any event the real temple-cleansing can only have come at the final crisis ; for from its nature it was and could be nothing else than a decisive throwing down of the gauntlet to the hierocracy, as it is recognized to be in Mark 11 : 27 f., and as is easily manifest from John 2 : 19 ; *cf.* Mark 14 : 58 ; 15 : 29.³³

We are willing to admit that the transposition of John 2 : 14-22 might have been purely conjectural. If needful, we may grant the same as to 12 : 42-50, though in the latter case modern critics would then have been, not only anticipated, but outdone. True, we have still an imperfect order when 12 : 42-50 precedes, as it certainly should, vss. 36*b*-41 ; for vss. 42 f. do not properly follow vs. 36*a*, as Tatian himself shows by his change of reading (*καί* for *ὁμῶς μέντοι*). The further transposition of 12 : 1-19 after vss. 20-36*a* is required by internal evidence ; but thereafter the sequence 11 : 47-53, 54-57 ; 12 : 20-36*a*, 1-19, 42-50, 36*b*-41 becomes irreproachable. We then understand (from 11 : 54-57) why the Greeks of 12 : 20 ff. cannot approach Jesus directly ; for the public entry of 12 : 1-19 has not yet taken place. Jesus is in seclusion at Ephraim (11 : 54), and can be approached only

³³ Of course, the saying had not been treasured up three or four years in the memory of the false witnesses and people.

through his intimates (12:20 ff.). The scenes of 12:20 ff., 1-19, are prepared for in 11:54-57, precisely as those of the visit at Tabernacles (5:2-47; 7:15-30) are prepared for in 7:11-13. Note also the relation of 11:47 ff., 51, 52 to 12:23-25, 32. Perhaps it is needless to remark how far better 12:36b follows after vs. 19 than after vs. 36a.

The transpositions of Tatian are, therefore, by no means all that are required by the narrative of the fourth gospel. Spitta's in chap. 18 has now the corroboration of *Sin. Syr.* That of chap. 14, advocated by me in 1893 independently of Spitta, I do not deem less probable. Burton's of 7:37-44 after vss. 45-52 is entirely commendable. Finally, in 8:12-10:42, a section which Tatian inserts as it stands, a solid, continuous mass, more complex transpositions are required than anywhere else in the gospel, whether it be for that reason or for some other that Tatian makes no alteration. Here Professor Burton proposes as a possibility the following order, without giving his reasons: 8:21-59; 9:1-41; 10:19-21; 8:12-20; 10:22-29, 1-18, 30-42.

If, then, I may return to the starting-point of an analysis originally undertaken without dreaming of external evidence in its support, till surprised to find myself anticipated by scribes and harmonists of the second century, I may briefly state conclusions as to this section of the gospel also based on internal evidence alone.

Professor Burton has already laid his finger upon one of the difficulties, the separation of the scene of 10:1-18 from that of the connected discourse 10:26-29 by vss. 22-25. Professor Burton would remedy this by intercalating 10:1-18 between vss. 29 and 30. But besides the close connection of vss. 29 and 30, 10:1 ff., as Holtzmann points out,³⁴ is inseparable from chap. 9. The warning not to follow false leaders, blind guides, usurping shepherds, is addressed to those who submit to the arrogant rule of the Pharisees, who have just excommunicated the restored blind man for his bold challenge of their judgment pronounced on Jesus. He is an example of those who, though unpretending, instinctly know their true Shepherd. This parable on the

³⁴ *Handkommentar, ad loc.*

instinct of the sheep corresponds to the synoptic saying on the inward light, Luke 11: 34-36 and parallels, likewise uttered in connection with a denunciation of the Pharisees as "blind guides;" *cf.* 9: 40 f. It is greatly confused by the relation into which it has been brought with the (now) ensuing parable of the Good Shepherd, 10: 7, 8*a*, 10-18, which is indeed related to it, as we shall see, but should not follow it. And the confusion is made worse confounded by the attempt to introduce a *third* comparison in vss. 7*b*, 9, where Jesus appears as the Door, resulting in the extraordinary mixture of vss. 7-9. To make sense of vs. 8 we are compelled to read in vs. 7 ὁ ποιμήν in place of ἡ θύρα. The change was made to accommodate vs. 9, which in its present place is simply a disturber of the peace. Doubtless this brief parable is precious and authentic, but in the present connection it is inadmissible. It would compel us to reject both parables, on the ground that such confusion and allegorizing are totally foreign to Jesus' teaching. For reasons soon to appear vs. 8*b* would seem to be from the same readjusting hand.

We are now prepared for the true solution of the difficulty. Its prime cause is found in 10: 22-25, which should be the opening paragraph of this entire section of the gospel, which we are accustomed to open (lamely enough³⁵) with 8: 12 ff. At the Feast of Dedication in December, called by Josephus *the Feast of Lights* on account of its salient feature, the grand illumination of Jerusalem, Jesus reappeared in the temple, and was immediately challenged to declare himself in plain terms. If we recognize in 7: 37 f. an allusion to the ceremony of water-pouring at Tabernacles, surely we cannot ignore so conspicuous a parallel as in 8: 12 ff. the allusion to the distinctive ceremony of the Feast of Lights. But this implies that 10: 22-25 should come *before* and not *after* the account of the healing of the blind man, rebuke of the Pharisees who claimed to see but were blind, and the discourse, 8: 12 ff., which begins: "I am the light of the

³⁵For how can the series of discourses in the temple (8: 20), debates with the Pharisees, and subsequent miracle on the sabbath (9: 14), with the ensuing events, all take place at Tabernacles, when in 7: 37 it was already "the last day, the great day of the feast," and the whole account of events on that occasion is brought to a formal conclusion in 7: 45-52, 37-44? See below for the true introduction to 8: 12 ff.

world, he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life."

But one step at a time. What answer does Jesus make to the challenge: "If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly"? From the present context one cannot but admit that it is rather an evasive one, either too much or too little; for even vs. 30 gives no idea of what Jesus means by his messiahship. From Mark 10:45 and Phil. 2:7-9 we know what to him, or at least to our author (*cf.* 1:29, 36; 3:14-16, etc.), was by this time most essential in it—exactly what we have in 10:7*,³⁶ 8a, 10-18. The thieves and robbers are not false *teachers*, but worthless *governors* of Israel, kings who sitting on the throne of David have fleeced and slaughtered and destroyed the flock for their own advantage (Zech. 11:4-17). It is because he comes not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life for the flock, that Jesus assumes the title to *govern* Israel, and now he tells them "plainly" that he is the Son of David.

After this we have no further difficulty with the connection of 10:26-39. But instead of passing on to vss. 40-42, which, of course, would close the section, we go back to 9:1 ff., now introduced by an exactly similar escape (*cf.* 10:31, 39 with 8:59). Here occurs the characteristic miracle of the feast, with the resulting controversy with the "blind" Pharisees, 9:35-10:6 (10:9 having perhaps once stood after vs. 5), and its effect, 10:19-21. Last of all the discourse, 8:12-59, to which the closing paragraph 10:40-42 joins on instead of to the almost identical situation of 10:39.

Of external evidence for this complex transposition we have but one infinitesimal trace. It has always been difficult to say why the majority of western texts which interpolate the *pericope adulterae* should insert it at just this point, John 7:53-8:11. Is it barely possible that the scribe who set this example had reason to suspect a gap between 7:37-52 and 8:12 ff.?³⁷

³⁶ For meaning of * see footnote 28.

³⁷ Or was he also so sagacious a critic as to observe that after 7:37 ("the last day of the feast"), 40-44, and 45-52 there must needs be a new explanation of the situation before the series of discourses and events of 8:12-20, 21 ff., etc., can follow?

The internal evidence occasions only *embarras de richesse*. It is impossible within reasonable limits to do more than make a beginning in noting the references which prove our proposed order the true one, viz.: 10:22-25, 7*, 8a, 10-18, 26-39; 9:1-10:5 (9?), 6, 19-21; 8:12-59; 10:40-42. But as we follow the page beginning at 8:12 (*cf.* 10:22 f.; 9:5, and 10:4), the presupposition of what the *restored order* makes to precede appears in almost every line. With vs. 14b *cf.* 9:29; with 15, 9:34; with 16, 9:39; with 19, 9:16-30; with 20, 10:22; with 21, 9:41; with 22-24, 9:35-41; with 25 ("that which I have been saying to you from the beginning," viz., "I am the Good Shepherd," etc.), 10:24 f., 7*, 8a, 10-18. Why does Jesus denounce his interlocutors, apparently without provocation, as "liars" and "murderers," 8:37, 40, 44, 55? Why does he challenge them to "convict him of sin," 8:46, if not because this philippic was once *preceded* by 9:17-34, in which his present pharisaic antagonists had carried their bigotry to the length, not only of threatening Jesus' own life as a sabbath-breaker, but of attempting to pervert one of the little ones which had believed in him (*cf.* 10:28), by telling him (9:24), "We know that this man [Jesus] is a sinner," and again (9:29), "We know that God hath spoken unto Moses,³⁸ but as for this man, we know not whence he is" (*cf.* 7:28; 8:14 f.). We must remember that in 8:12-59 the Good Shepherd is defending one of the little ones of his flock against the thieves and robbers who have usurped the power they now employ to slander and kill Jesus, to cast his new disciple out of the synagogue (9:34), and to pervert the rest (10:20). *Cf.* Mark 3:22-30 and parallels.

A single objection may be raised—the *πάλιν* in 10:31 (*cf.* 8:59). But the *πάλιν* of this verse is *wanting in both Tatian and the Sinaitic Syriac*, in spite of the fact that both make 8:59 precede, precisely as in the common text.

The transpositions we have proposed in the text of John may safely be left to speak for themselves, even without external evidence. Their very dimensions, to say nothing of the

³⁸The Johannine irony is very manifest in 9:29, especially when we note in connection with 10:7*, 8a, 10-18 that in the Kabbalah Moses is "the faithful shepherd."

evidence of redaction (*e. g.*, in 10:7-9), should at once dispose of any theory of mere accident or textual corruption. Yet the extraordinary coincidence of *Sin. Syr.* in 18:12-27, of Tatian and the peculiar source of Matthew in chaps. 2-6, and of Tatian alone in his major transpositions, is a phenomenon impossible to explain by any assumed critical sagacity on the part of scribe or harmonist. In many cases the assumed sagacity is conspicuously wanting. The alternative remains of extra-canonical sources, a comparison of which by second-century scribes would, under certain circumstances, produce the interpolation of passages such as 5:3^b, 4, and 7:53-8:11 at points where they were either actually demanded by the context (*cf.* 5:3 and 7), something similar having stood in the source employed by the gospel writer; or else where these sources indicated the existence of a gap (as after 7:52). Under other circumstances second-century writers, knowing these extra-canonical parallels, might derive immeasurable aid in perceiving where the final redactor of the gospel had changed its order, and, if bold enough, like the scribe of *Sin. Syr.*, or if engaged like Tatian in a work of readjustment of the gospel tradition, might partially employ this means.

Such we believe to be the most rational explanation of the facts. If, however, the surprising coincidences show nothing more than a remarkable anticipation of a modern analysis by higher critics of the second century, it will be worth the while of every student to read through the fourth gospel once more in the following order:

- i. The ministry in coöperation with the Baptist. [1:1-18], 19-51; [2:1-11]; 3:22-4:3 (44?).
- ii. The Galilean ministry. (4:46a²); 2:12; 4:46b-54; 6:1-71.
- iii. The period of exile and Samaritan ministry; Jesus at the Feast of Pentecost. 4:4-42 (43?); 5:1-47; 7:15-24; (4:45?).
- iv. The visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles. 7:1-14, 25-30; 3:1-21; 7:31-36, 45-52, 37-44.
- v. The visit at the Feast of Dedication. 10:22-25, 7*, 8a, [8b*], 10-18, 26-39; 9:1-10:5, 9*, 19-21; 8:12-59; 10:40-42.
- vi. The period of retirement in Ephraim. 11:1-57; 12:20-36a, 1-19, 42-50, 36b-41.

vii. The final Passover. 2:13*, 14-22, [23-25*]; 13:1-15, [16], 17-19, [20], 21-35, 15:1-16:33; [13:36-38]; 14:1-31; 17:1-18:13, 24, 14, 15, 19-23, 16-18, 25b-40; 19:1-20:31; [21:1-25].

The transpositions underscored with a straight line rest upon internal evidence only; that underscored with a wavy line is supported by the Sinaitic Syriac. The rest, including all the major transpositions, are supported by Tatian.